



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,620	11/26/2003	Richard J. Melker	UF-246XCD1	7104
23557 7590 04/16/2007 SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			EXAMINER TURK, NEIL N	
			ART UNIT 1743	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/722,620

Applicant(s)

MELKER ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Turk

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3. Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :7/17/06, ~~6~~27/05, 3/16/04, 10/10/05.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the medication and marker are never recited as taken by the patient so as to enable the analysis of a breath sample for the presence or absence of the detection marker. Claim 1 recites providing a patient with a medication and a detectable marker that is to be taken on his/her own actions, and then results subsequently obtaining and analyzing a sample. Such that the patient's own actions does not include having to take the medication, the analysis of the sample to confirm the presence or absence of the marker is incomplete and without meaning. Further, claim 25 requires that the marker is absorbed in the patient's gastrointestinal tract and excreted in the lungs, a further step that is not properly claimed given that independent claim 1 does not require that the marker is ever taken by the patient. It is also unclear in claim 1 how the medication is taken. It is unclear if the medicine is taken orally if it is sucked on the by the patient or if it is digested by the patient. Between the above two oral administrations of the medication and marker, the sample of exhaled breath would be completely different, as one would be directly from the mouth and the other would have interacted with the patient's stomach. Claim 1 also does not specify any particular place that the sample of the patient's breath is obtained,

Art Unit: 1743

such as through a tube or into a chamber. As such, any exhaling of the patient's breath would constitute obtaining a sample to confirm the presence or absence of the marker.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the patient". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This is further seen in the dependent claims where the same term appears.

Claim 4 recites that the sample is analyzed to confirm the presence of the marker. This recitation lends itself to a presupposed answer, whereas the independent claim calls for analyzing the breath to confirm the presence or absence of the marker in the patient's breath. Examiner assumes Applicant intended to recite the same such determination in claim 4.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: how the presence and concentration of the marker are determined by the unique electronic fingerprint. Claim 5 recites that the sensor technology produces a unique electronic fingerprint to characterize the marker, but does not recite which steps are taken in accordance with such a fingerprint in order to determine the claimed and presence and concentration of the marker. As such a sensor which produces a unique output to characterize the marker will be taken to constitute such limitations.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how a coating is a detectable marker on the medication. It is unclear if Applicant intended to recite that the marker is provided on the medication in the form of a coating so as to further limit the structure of the marker.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "data" is unclear such that independent claim 1 merely recites noting a presence or absence of the marker in the analyzing of the sample.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what is meant by "transmitting data" such that the claim does not contain any parallel recitation to where the data is obtained and then to where such data is transmitted. As the claim is currently read, a visual indication of the data from the detector would constitute transmitting the data from the detector to the person(s) analyzing the sample.

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how the limitations of claims 23 and 24

further limit the method of claim 1. Further, claims 23 and 24 recite reacting with enzymes and acids, respectively, in order for the marker to be detectable. Claim 1 recites a detectable marker exists at the offset, without any necessary reaction. It is also unclear how the marker "first reacts" with the enzymes or acids such that the marker may contact other components within the body before such contact to initiate a reaction. Claim 1 does not recite where or how the pill is taken and thereby any medication that at some point passes through the mouth or the stomach, respectively with claims 23 and 24, can be taken to read on the limitations as given in claims 23 and 24 for reacting with the respective parts. Even if Applicant intends claim 23 to recite that the medication with the marker is taken orally, it is unclear what further structure in the marker allows it to react first with enzymes in the patient's mouth and not to react first with a different component or at a different point. This is likewise seen in claim 24 as it is unclear what further structure is provided to the marker so as to have it first react with acids in the patient's stomach and what precludes it from reacting first with a different component or at a different point. In claim 25, it is unclear what further structure is associated with the marker for such absorption and secretion and how the marker is absorbed in the patient's gastrointestinal tract and excreted in the lungs such that claim 1 does not require the medication with the marker to be taken in a fashion to require contact with the marker. Claim 1 merely recites providing a medication with a marker to the patient and obtaining a sample of the patient's breath, without providing an actual administering of the medication and marker and how the medication and marker are administered.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the data". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is also unclear how the data from the analysis results in determining marker concentration and thus medication concentration, such that independent claim 1 merely recites analyzing the sample to determine the presence or absence of the marker in the patient's breath. It is unclear what further steps are taken from the analysis done in claim 1 to go from such data in the sense of a "yes" or "no" (presence or absence) information to transform such data into marker concentration and then derived into the medication concentration.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 28 recites that the analysis further includes detecting exhalation of the patient's breath with a sensor, however, claim 1 recites that the sample of the patient's breath is obtained (a positive indication of possession of the breath) and then an analysis is undertaken to determine the presence or absence of the marker. Thereby the further step of claim 28 appears to be out of order with the steps presented by independent claim 1 and further given that the claim 1 recites a positive possession of the breath, the limitations of detecting the exhalation of the patient's breath with a sensor is unclear.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the

steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: how the medication combined with the detectable marker is produced. Claim 29 recites steps of identifying a marker substance detectable in gaseous breath and then producing a medication with said detectable marker substance. Applicant has not provided specific manufacturing steps for producing the combination of the medicine and the marker so as to be detectable and act as an indication of patient compliance. A general statement of producing the medication combined with the detectable marker will be read to constitute any production step(s) (or the final product is a medicine with a detectable marker, in which the production is inherent to arrive at the point) which results in a medicine with a detectable marker.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-21, and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katzman (5,962,335).

Katzman discloses a breath test for detection of drug metabolism. Katzman discloses that a safe and effective amount of the drug, isotropically-labelled, is administered to a subject. Katzman discloses a breath test kit in which after a suitable amount of time the exhaled breath of the subject is analyzed to determine the concentration of a metabolite, which is then used to determine the rate of metabolism of the drug (abstract). Katzman also discloses that the exhaled breath of the subject is analyzed before the drug is administered so as to give a baseline for the concentration of the metabolite in the breath of the subject (lines 50-67, col. 5). Katzman also discloses that the label used to identify the metabolite in the exhaled breath of the subject should at least be present on a portion of the drug that forms the metabolite (columns 7 and 8; lines 22-26, col. 6). Katzman discloses that compositions for oral administration include such things as powders or granules, suspensions or solutions in water, capsules and tablets and flavorings may be desirable. Katzman also discloses that the drug may be administered topically, such as intranasally, or parenterally such as by intravenous drip or intraperitoneal, subcutaneous, or intramuscular injection, or administration may be done inhalation (lines 43-67, col. 6). Katzman discloses that following the step of administering the drug to the subject, the exhaled breath of the subject is analyzed to detect a metabolite or metabolites, and subsequently the concentration of the metabolite is used to determine the rate of metabolism of the drug (lines 13-36, col. 7; col. 14). Katzman discloses that the metabolite or metabolites are detected by an instrument such as a gas analyzer, mass spectrometer, or infrared spectrometer (lines 21-36, col. 7; lines 38-40, col. 8). Examiner asserts that the

detection of the metabolite(s) in the subject's exhaled breath would indicate that the drug had been taken. Katzman also discloses that the breath test could be used for therapeutic drug monitoring in determining the concentration of the metabolite(s) in the exhaled breath of the subject and using such information to properly adjust the dosing regimen for the subject (lines 58-67, col. 9; lines 1-2, col. 10). Examiner asserts that the acquisition of the two concentration measurements necessary for employing the difference between them to establish an acceptable dosage regimen would inherently constitute recording the two concentration measurements at their respective measurement steps.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forester (4,762,719).

Forester discloses a cough drop comprising a hard candy outer shell and a powdered centerfill containing a rapidly-dissolving powder and an active ingredient such as menthol and eucalyptus which is in the form of a liquid blend and a spray-dried powder. Forester discloses that the hard candy outer shell also contains menthol and eucalyptus as a liquid blend (abstract). Forester discloses that the rapidly-dissolving powders used enhance active ingredient release to provide the aromatic vaporization of the ingredient into the oral and nasal cavities (lines 50-68, col. 1; column 3 and Example 3). Forester also discloses that the flavors which may be employed in the hard candy shell include both natural and synthetic flavors such as citrus oils of cherry, lemon, orange, and lime, or essential oils such as peppermint, spearmint, or wintergreen, and

Art Unit: 1743

also synthetic flavors (lines 48-55, col. 2). Examiner asserts that smelling of the exhaled breath would confirm or deny the presence of the detectable marker, thus showing if the cough drop had been taken or not.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1743

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forester in view of Payne (WO 98/39470) and in view of Kell (5,652,146).

Forester has been discussed above.

Forester does not disclose analyzing the patient's breath to confirm the presence of the marker by either semiconductor gas sensor technology or conductive polymer gas sensor technology.

Payne discloses a method of detecting conditions by analysis of gases or vapors. Payne discloses that the gas sensing device may comprise an array of semiconducting organic polymer gas sensors and the presence of any species present in the gas phase may be detected (pages 1-3). Payne discloses that other types of gas sensors such as metal oxide semiconductor (MOS), quartz resonator or SAW devices, as well as mass spectrometry or a GC-MS device might be used (pages 3-5). Payne discloses that an array of such sensors are used so as to permit selective identification of a wide range of gases by recognizing the characteristic "fingerprint" of response across the array. Payne discloses that the output of the sensors correlates the output pattern (analyzed by analysis means 22) with the occurrence of certain conditions (page 4). Payne also discloses that it is possible to reduce water content by using purge and trap systems (page 6).

Kell discloses a method of monitoring patient compliance with medication prescriptions. Kell discloses that it is important to monitor a patient's regimen of

medicine to ensure the medication is actually being taken as required (lines 11-16, 37-41, col. 1).

It would have been obvious to modify Forester to test to see that the medication is actually being taken such as taught by Kell such that it is important to know if the necessary medication is actually being taken and further to test the breath sample with semiconducting gas sensors for detecting the presence of gases or vapors such as taught by Payne in order to provide dynamic sensing technology for gases or vapors that may produce a characteristic response to correlate a condition such as to show the presence or absence of the menthol (or possible flavor ingredient of Forester) in the patient's breath.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forester in view of Payne and in view of Ueda.

Forester and Payne have been discussed above.

Forester and Payne do not specifically disclose dehumidifying the sample of the patient's breath prior to analysis.

Ueda discloses a method and device for expiratory air examination. Ueda teaches that an absorbing filter is provided for removing particulates and contaminants which would hinder the aimed examination. Ueda also discloses that a dehumidifying agent may be included partially in the absorbing filter (lines 11-62, col. 6).

It would have been obvious to modify Forester to include dehumidifying the air sample with a dehumidifying agent before analysis such as taught by Ueda so as to

Art Unit: 1743

remove any moisture that may hinder the aimed examination and further given that Payne discloses a similar breath sampling method and device in which Payne teaches possibly including filters or reducing water content.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzman in view of Payne and in view of Ueda.

Katzman, Payne, and Ueda have been discussed above.

It would have been obvious to modify Katzman to include dehumidifying the air sample with a dehumidifying agent before analysis such as taught by Ueda so as to remove any moisture that may hinder the aimed examination and further given that Payne discloses a similar breath sampling method and device in which Payne teaches possibly including filters or reducing water content.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil Turk whose telephone number is 571-272-8914. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NT


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700